

Appl. No. 10/652,890

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187

Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005

Response to November 18, 2004 Office Action

Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1, 7, 14, and 20 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 2, 5, 8-13, 15, 18, and 21-27 are amended. Claims 2-6, 8-13, 15-30 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a method of producing a composite sheet including a ceramic layer and to a method of producing a laminate by using the composite sheet. More particularly, the invention relates to a method of producing a composite sheet that is preferably used for the production of a variety of wiring boards and a wiring board applied to packages for containing semiconductor devices, and is particularly used for the production of ceramic boards having wiring conductors capable of radiating the heat and permitting the flow of heavy currents of power module boards. The invention further relates to a method of producing a laminate such as a wiring board using the composite sheet. (Applicant's specification, at p. 1, lines 6-17).

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Enloe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,920,640).

This rejection is moot with respect to claims 1, 7, 14, and 20 due to the cancellation of these claims. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 5, 9, 10, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, and 30. These claims now depend either directly or indirectly from one or more of amended claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26, which were rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Since claims 5, 9, 10,

Appl. No. 10/652,890

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187

Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005

Response to November 18, 2004 Office Action

Customer No.: 26021

18, 22, 23, 27, 29, and 30 now depend from allowed claims, they are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 5, 9, 10, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, and 30 is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Heinss (U.S. Patent No. 3,768,144).

This rejection is moot with respect to claims 14 and 20 due to the cancellation of these claims. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 18, 22, 23, 27, and 29. These claims now depend either directly or indirectly from one or more of amended claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26, which were rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Since claims 18, 22, 23, 27, and 29 now depend from allowed claims, they are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 18, 22, 23, 27, and 29 is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 17, 22-24, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fleming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,744).

This rejection is moot with respect to claim 14 due to the cancellation of this claim. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 15, 17, 22-24, and 27-29. These claims now depend either directly or indirectly from one or more of amended claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26, which were rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Since claims 15, 17, 22-24, and 27-29 now depend from allowed claims, they are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 15, 17, 22-24, and 27-29 is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/652,890

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187

Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005

Response to November 18, 2004 Office Action

Customer No.: 26021

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinss (U.S. Patent No. 3,768,144). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 19 now depends from amended claim 26, which was rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claim 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 19 is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,744). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 16 now depends from amended claim 26, which was rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claim 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 16 is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 14-18, 23, 24, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,231,707) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, January 1990 and Fleming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,744).

This rejection is moot with respect to claims 1 and 14 due to the cancellation of these claims. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 2-5, 10, 11, 15-18, 23, 24, and 27-30. These claims now depend either directly or indirectly from one or more of amended claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26, which were rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25, and 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

Appl. No. 10/652,890

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187

Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005

Response to November 18, 2004 Office Action

Customer No.: 26021

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Since claims 2-5, 10, 11, 15-18, 23, 24, and 27-30 now depend from allowed claims, they are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 2-5, 10, 11, 15-18, 23, 24, and 27-30 is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 5 and 18 above, and further in view of Heinss (U.S. Patent No. 3,768,144).

Claims 6 and 19 depend from claims 13 and 26, respectively, which were rewritten in independent form. The Office states that claims 13 and 26 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 6 and 19 is thus respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

The Office states, "Claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." In response, the Applicant rewrote claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25 and 26 in the manner suggested by the Office. Withdrawal of this objection and allowance of claims 8, 12, 13, 21, 25 and 26 is thus respectfully requested.

The art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been considered. However, it is submitted that this art neither describes nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

Appl. No. 10/652,890
Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005
Response to November 18, 2004 Office Action

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187
Customer No.: 26021

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6810 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: February 9, 2005

By: 

Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701